A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

THE "POLYGLOT" ARABIC TEXT OF DANIEL AND ITS AFFINITIES[1]

HENRY S. GEHMAN
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

BOTH the Paris Polyglot (1645) and the London Polyglot (1657) contain an Arabic translation of the entire Bible. The fact that both Le Jay and Walton included this language

[1] BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burkitt, F. C., *Arabic Versions*, Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, I, 136—138

Burkitt, F. C., *Arabic* under *Other Versions*, vid. *Text and Versions*, Encyclopaedia Biblica, 5012

Cornill, Carl Heinrich, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, Leipzig, 1886, 49—57

Döderlein, D. Joh. Christoph, *Von Arabischen Psaltern*, Eichhorn's Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Literatur (1778), II 151—179

Döderlein, D. Joh. Christoph, *Von Arabischen Psaltern, opere citato* (1779), IV, 57—96.

Eichborn, Johann Gottfried, *Arabische Übersetzungen*, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Göttingen, 1823, II, 230—319

Graf, Georg, *Die Christlich-Arabische Literatur bis zur Fränkischen Zeit*, Straßburger Theologische Studien, VII. Band, 1. Heft, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1905, 1—24

Hyvernat, H., *Arabes (Versions)*, Vigouroux, Dictionnaire de la Bible; this is a very full article.

Kahle, Paul, *Die Arabischen Bibelübersetzungen*, Texte mit Glossar und Literaturübersicht, Leipzig, 1904

McMahon, A. L., *Versions of the Bible*, Catholic Encyclopaedia, XIV, 367—377

Nestle, E., *Arabische Bibelübersetzungen*, Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3te Auflage, III, 90—95; this is also an extensive article.

in their two monumental works shows that in the judgment of both editors the Arabic versions were of considerable importance and had to be reckoned with in any comparative study of texts and translations. In this connexion we note in the *Instituti Operis Ratio* of the Paris Polyglot this extravagant and uncritical statement: *Arabicus contextus septima et postrema divini aedificii Columna est. Eum omnes Orientales Ecclesiae magnopere venerantur: vel hinc maximam mutuatur commendationem, quod S. Hieronymi saeculo, quidam e sacris libris hac lingua scripti reperirentur, quorum auxilio librum Iob in septingentis ferme aut octingentis versibus, ut ex praefixa huic libro praefatione manifestum est, restituit.* Indeed the mere fact that Arabic for many years has been the *lingua franca* of the East should have caused scholars to devote more attention to the Arabic translations of the Bible out of linguistic interest alone.

Walton in his *Prolegomena* XIV, 18, on the testimony of Augustinus Justinianus Episcopus Nebiensis, states that there were two Arabic versions of the Old Testament in vogue among the Christians. He had used both of them and calls the one recension the Syriac and the other the Egyptian from the two regions in which they were respectively read. Cornelius a Lapide

Rhode, Joseph Francis, *The Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt*, a Catholic University of America dissertation, 1921; this is an excellent monograph on the subject.

Ryssel, V., *Die arabische Übersetzung des Micha in der Pariser und Londoner Polyglotte*, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 5ter Jahrgang. 1885, 102—138; this article is important philologically.

Schelling, Joseph Friedrich, *Die arabische Bibelausgabe von 1752*, Eichhorn's Repertorium, (1782), X, 154—164

Swete, H. B., *The Arabic Version*, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Cambridge, 1914, 110—111

Tychsen, O. G., *Über die Quelle, aus welcher die Handschrift der arabischen Version in den Polyglotten geflossen ist*, Eichhorn's Repertorium (1782), X, 95—110

Vaccari, Alb., *Le Versioni Arabe dei Profeti*, Biblica, II, 401—423; III, 401-423

Wald, Samuel Gottlieb, *Über die arabische Übersetzung des Daniel in den Polyglotten*, Eichhorn's Repertorium, (1784), XIV, 204—211

Walton, Brianus, *De Lingua Arabica et Scripturae Versionibus Arabicis*, Proleg. XIV, Biblia Polyglotta, Vol. I, 93—97, London, 1657

names the one the Antiochean and the other the Alexandrian. This view is quoted by Döderlein, Eichhorn's Repertorium, IV, 60—61. He adds, however, *Vermuthlich gab es noch mehrere*, and cites Franz Nazari who refers to an Alexandrian, Antiochean, Babylonian, and Syrian recension. Cornill, *opere citato*, p. 49, also makes reference to the Egyptian and the Syriac recensions in the Arabic.

Walton notes besides (*loc. cit.*) that there was a third Arabic version of the Scriptures prepared by Johannes Episcopus Seviliensis in 719 (*sic*). According to the Spanish Chronicle[2] this translation was made in the reign of Don Pelayo, the first year of whose reign was 719 A. D. and 99 (*sic*) according to the Mohammedan reckoning.[3] It appears that this rendering was made between the end of the fourth and the end of the sixth year of his reign. The chronicler, after mentioning the close of four years of this reign, says that he has nothing important to record for the fifth year[4], and in the course of his narrative he comes to the translation of the Bible into Arabic. Shortly after this he mentions the conclusion of six years of the reign of Don Pelayo. It seems, therefore, reasonable to assume that this Arabic recension[5] of the Bible was made in 724 A. D.

---

[2] *Primera Crónica General, Estoria de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289. Publicada por* Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Madrid, 1906. Tomo I, *sub* El Rey Don Pelayo.

[3] El primero anno del su regnado fue en la era de 757 quando andaua el anno de la Encarnacion en 719, e el dell imperio de Leon en 6, e del papa Gregorio en 9, e el de Carlos rey de Francia en 2, e el de Vlit rey de los alaraues en 11, e el de los alaraues en 99. He makes an error of about a year in the Mohammedan reckoning.

[4] Del quinto anno del regnado del rey don Pelayo non fallamos ninguna cosa que de contar sea que a la estoria pertenesca si non tanto que murio Omar rey de los alaraues e finco su hermano Yzid por rey et sennor del regno ...

[5] *Op. cit.*, Tomo I, 326: En aquel tiempo otrossi fue en Seuilla el sancto obispo Johan, omne de mui grand santidad et de buena uida et santa, que era llamado de los alaraues por su arauigo Çaeyt *almatran*; et era mui sabio en la lengua arauiga e fizo Dios por el muchos miraglos; et traslado las santas escripturas en arauigo, at fizo las esposiciones dellas segund la santa escriptura, et assi las dexo despues a su muerte pora los qui uiniessen despues del.

Padre Juan de Mariana (1537—1624), *Historia General de España*, VII, 3, also says[6] that John, Bishop of Sevilla, translated the Bible into Arabic with the intention of helping the Christians and the Moors, since Arabic was widely and commonly used by all. Juan de Mariana adds that copies of this translátion were preserved until his day and seen in some parts of Spain.

It is a marvel with what rapidity Arabic was adopted in the conquered territories; in fact it seems to have spread like wildfire. Now if there was need for an Arabic recension in Spain thirteen years after the conquest, we should think that the Christians of the Orient used one before this date. It seems clear from our Spanish references that this Arabic version produced in Spain was not a mere academic exercise. Graf (*op. cit.*) makes no reference to this work by the Bishop of Sevilla, but p. 27 he records an Arabic translation of the four Gospels. In this collection, Luke (and presumably the others also) was translated by Isaak Velasquez of Cordoba in A. D. 946. There is no doubt that the Christians in the East required an Arabic recension long before this edition of the Gospels appeared in Spain.

It is not improbable that there were Arabic versions of the Scriptures or at least of certain books of the Bible, during the seventh[7] and eighth centuries. When the Mohammedans became masters of Egypt in the seventh century, the connexions between the Melchite Church and Constantinople were disturbed and finally severed. Dr. Rhode very aptly suggests that the Melchite Church had no vernacular language to form a barrier, as it were, against the encroachments of the Arabic language which,

---

[6] Contemporáneo dellos fué Juan, prelado de Sevilla, que tradujo la Biblia en lengua arábiga con intento de ayudar a los cristianos y a los moros, a causa que la lengua arábiga se usaba mucho y comunmente entre todos; la latina ordinariamente ni se usaba ni se sabía. Hay algunos traslados desta traducción, que se han conservado hasta nuestra edad, y se ven en algunos lugares de España.

[7] Ṭabarî (Ed. De Goeje, II, 399) notes, A. H. 61, that ʿAbd Allab, son of the conqueror of Egypt, read the book of Daniel, while he was with his father in that country. Although he does not state what version it was, it may have been an Arabic translation.

with the beginning of the eighth century, was forced upon the conquered people. Under these conditions the Melchites at an early date would have adopted the language of everyday life, the Arabic, even in their liturgy. On the other hand, the native Egyptians were at first favoured by the Arabs and also, as is natural, clung more tenaciously to their Coptic vernacular. It was easier for the Greek settlers to adopt the language of the new rulers than for the native Egyptians to give up their national tongue. This explains why the Monophysites did not until a later date require an Arabic version of the Bible. If the Spanish Chronicler is correct in placing the Arabic translation of Sevilla at 724, there is no doubt that the Christians in the East who spoke the language of the Koran and who were in a thoroughly Arabic environment needed an Arabic Bible at just as early a date. In fact we should think that the Alexandrian and Antiochean Arabic recensions were made before that time.

The London Polyglot appeared in 1657, and in its *Praefatio*, p. 4, we note that the Arabic text of the Paris Heptaglotta is based on a manuscript which had been written three hundred years previously and brought to light by Gabriel Sionita who edited it for publication in Le Jay's Polyglot. On the following page, § 15, we are informed that in various places Sionita's manuscript had been defective and that consequently the editor used different manuscripts to correct and supplement the Arabic text for the London Edition. One of these manuscripts is now in the Bodleian Library.

Since the book of Daniel is our theme, we may in this connexion refer to an Arabic edition of this book that is not generally known. Eichhorn, *Einleitung* II, 262—263, makes mention of what he calls an unimportant translation of Genesis, Psalms, and Daniel directly from the Hebrew into Arabic by R. Saadias Ben Levi Asnekoth, a learned Jew of Morocco, who lived in the first half of the seventeenth century. Needless to say, this translation has no textual value, although it is interesting to know that such a piece of work was done; it is found in manuscript number 5503 in the British Museum.

Without disparaging the work performed by scholars in this field, the Arabic versions still offer an unexplored region for

biblical students. Wald (*op. cit.*), in his comparison of the Poly-
glot text with the readings of the Sixtine edition, noticed that
Daniel is a translation of the Alexandrian recension of Theo-
dotion. He also found some passages where the Alexandrian
text was not followed. Although he does not give us a detailed
analysis and accurate study of the book, he started on a path
which few scholars have followed. He saw the possibilities of
the Arabic version, for he concludes (*op. cit.*, p. 211): *Aus diesen
Anzeigen und der Diöces der alexandrinischen Recension läßt
sich mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit mutmaßen daß diese ara-
bische Übersetzung ... zur kritischen Geschichte der Übersetzung
des Theodotio viel beitragen werde.* Hyvernat, *Arabes (Versions)*,
op. cit. also sees the value of the Arabic translations: *Les ver-
sions arabes n'ont donc pas beaucoup d'autorité, cependant la
critique y trouve parfois des variantes qui jettent une lumière
inespérée sur la version syriaque et surtout sur la version
alexandrine. En tout cas elles occupent une place importante
dans l'histoire de la Bible.* We may also in this connexion note
the observation of Vaccari, *Biblica*, II, 402: *Spero che il dotto
lettore, se avrà la pazienza di seguirmi, crederà non inutile la
mia fatica, e penserà con me, che le antiche versioni arabe della
Bibbia, anche le fatte di seconda mano su altre versioni, non
meritano poi quel disprezzo in cui generalmente le tengono
gli eruditi.*

About a year ago my preceptor, Professor James A. Mont-
gomery, suggested the advisability of making a study of the
"Polyglot" Arabic version of Daniel. For the first seven chap-
ters I compared the Paris and London Polyglots word for word
with each other as I collated them with the Greek text as
published by Swete. In every instance the two versions were
the same, except that Walton omits 3 24–90, τῶν τριῶν παιδῶν
αἴνεσις. Chapters 8–12 were collated from the London Poly-
glot, but all difficult or suspected passages were compared with
the readings of the Paris edition. In all cases they were the
same except in the case of one diacritical mark which will be
noted below. Walton concludes with Chapter 12, while directly
after this chapter Le Jay adds 14, حبر بيل الصلم. It is note-
worthy that the London Polyglot makes such a faithful copy

of the book of Daniel from the Paris edition. This is in marked contrast to what Cornill observes on the Arabic texts of Ezekiel (*op. cit.*, pp. 49—56); in that case the Paris Polyglot represents the Egyptian recension, while the London edition reproduces the Syriac tradition.

All the collations have been compared with the variants listed in Holmes-Parsons, and in this labour Professor Montgomery generously aided me and also gave me access to his unpublished studies on the Book of Daniel. The results of his investigations[6] which have a bearing on the Arabic version may be summed up in this diagram:

$$\text{Hexaplar} = \text{Or}^{\text{P(alestinian)}} \quad \text{V, 62, 147}$$

Lucian	Or$^{\text{C(onstantinopolitan)}}$
22, 36, 48, 51, 231, c	A, Q, 106, 35, 230, 42

The Arabic recension as published in the two Polyglot Bibles is a representative of the Origenian Constantinopolitan text. The evidence of the collations is so overwhelming that there is no doubt about this matter. In many cases it corrects A and also 106, but it consistently follows the group[6]. In fact it is one of the best representatives of the Or$^{\text{C}}$ group that we have; in making any study of the Constantinopolitan text the Arabic stands on a par with the Greek and cannot be left out of account. It is rather remarkable that the Arabic-speaking Melchite Church had such a pure representative of the group.

The misprints in the Arabic text are very few. In 4 (23) 20, both have يقضان for يقظان. In 9 19, the London Polyglot wrongly reads اعفر for اغفر which the Paris edition has correctly. In 10 5, both versions read متمنطق for متنطق; in 11 30, both texts have فيمتاض for فيمتاظ; also يتفظن for يتفطن. In 12 10, both Bibles have ومن زوأم which doubtless is a misprint for ومن زمان. These errors reveal how closely Walton reprinted Le Jay's text.

---

[6] See the preceding essay by Professor Montgomery, pp. 289 ff.

It is rather noteworthy how readily the Greek language lends itself to be turned into Arabic. We have in Daniel not only a faithful translation, but also an excellent and fluent rendering; it is literal without being literalistic. This is partly due to the genius of the Arabic tongue to express the spirit of the Greek, but also to the ability of the translator, who apparently was well acquainted with both languages. In this study I shall attempt not only to produce an array of facts and proofs, but also to visualize the translator at his task and present the psychology of his work.

It is hardly necessary to quote any verses to show how worthy the translation is. The excellency of a rendering can sometimes be felt, rather than be expressed by words or proved by haphazard excerpts; an estimate of its quality is gained rather by reading the work as a whole than by mechanically quoting extracts. The translator's method, however, can by appreciated by a few observations.

He is literal, but good. Among many examples take 7 26, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν μεταστήσουσιν τοῦ ἀφανίσαι καὶ τοῦ ἀπολέσαι ἕως τέλους; وينقلون الرياسة ليفسدوا ويهلكوا إلي النهاية. It is interesting to note how the Arabic lends itself to be literal and yet idiomatic. Thus 7 13, ἐρχόμενος ἦν is rendered by كان اتيا. The translator does not always feel himself bound to interpret the cases literally; thus a preposition may be employed, as in 2 48; there ἄρχοντα σατραπῶν is turned into رئيسًا علي عظمآء الجيو ش. Sometimes conjunctions are not rendered literally; in those cases the meaning remains apparent from the general context. Thus 4 (8)5, ἕως ἦλθεν Δανιήλ is translated simply by فدخل دانيّل. On the other hand the failure to translate a conjunction literally may present a more graphic picture of the situation. Thus in 7 4, ἐθεώρουν ἕως οὗ ἐξετίλη τὰ πτερὰ αὐτῆς, the effect is heightened: ونظرت وإذا جناحاها تمعطا Occasionally in passages where Theodotion is stiff and lifeless, the translator infuses a spirit into his work. As an example of this take 9 16, ὅτι ἡμάρτομεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν

πατέρων ἡμῶν Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ ὁ λαός σου εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐγένετο

ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς περικύκλῳ ἡμῶν; لانا اخطانا بظلاماتنا وبظلامات

ابائنا الّذين باير وشليم وصار شعبك للعار عند الّذين حولنا

Sometimes the Arabic is more emphatic than the Greek: 4 (33) 30,

αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, في هذه السّاعة بعينها. Simple sentences of the

Greek are rendered into Arabic expressions that are just as
simple, but with the Arabic touch perhaps a little more attrac-

tive. 9 23, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμῶν σὺ εἶ, لانّك رجل لشهوات انت, is
just as plain in the Arabic.

We meet also passages where the translator, in interpreting
the meaning of the sentence, amplifies the expression. Thus in

2 31, καὶ ἡ πρόσοψις αὐτῆς ὑπερφερής reads in Arabic, وطلعتها

كثيرة البهاء جدّا. Likewise in 2 34, καὶ ἐλέπτυνεν αὐτοὺς εἰς

τέλος the translation is made very clear by a slight addition:

ودتّهما ناعمًا إلي الغاية. In one instance the translation would
have been clear without any supplementary phrase, but in spite of
this it has been added. Thus 11 40 συγκερατισθήσεται is rendered

by يتناطم بقرنه. This may be due to dittography of συγκερατι.

It is continually apparent that although the translator is
literal, he is interpreting, not words, but ideas. Although the
group in 12 6 reads εἶπον, he does not forget that two persons
are speaking, and consequently he employs the dual, قالا. Like-
wise in 7 4, he has recourse to the dual: ἔχουσα πτερά, لها

جناحان; πτερά αὐτῆς, جناحاها. On the other hand, in 11 27,
for ἀμφότεροι οἱ βασιλεῖς, he feels free not to use a dual,

والملوك معًا. This again reveals our translator as a man who
allowed himself some flexibility in his renderings.

The translator does not feel obliged to use a standard form
or expression for the same idea. In 3 21, καὶ ἐβλήθησαν εἰς τὸ

μέσον τῆς καμίνου, the τὸ μέσον is not translated, والقوا في اتّون.
There is a possibility that his manuscript did not have τὸ μέσον,
since verses 11 and 15 both read, with a passive verb, εἰς τὴν

κάμινον, في اتّون; the same phrase is used in verse 20 with the active. On the other hand, he may have been influenced by his translation of verses 11, 15 and 20, and since the sense was the same, not have taken the pains to translate τὸ μέσον. We should note, however, that in verses 23 and 24 where we find εἰς μέσον τῆς καμίνου and ἐν μέσῳ respectively, the Arabic correspondingly has في وسط and في وسط اتّون. We are hardly justified in asserting that the absence of في وسط in verse 21 proves that τὸ μέσον was not in the Greek original which was in the hands of the author of our recension. On the whole, he impresses us as being a man of originality and with some independence of judgment. Now in 3 93 we read: τότε προσῆλθεν Ναβουχοδο- νοσὸρ πρὸς τὴν θύραν τῆς καμίνου τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς καιομένης. In the Arabic τὴν θύραν is not translated: حينئذٍ تقدّم بختنصّر إلى اتّون النار المتوقّد. The meaning, of course, is practically the same, and accordingly the translator may have chosen not to be painfully literal.

To avoid a literal translation, the seventh conjugation with the nominative may be employed to render a direct object. Thus in 9 27 where A reads καταπαύσει θυσιαστήριον καὶ θυσίαν, the Arabic has تنكفّ المذابح والذبائح. The ultimate sense is the same.

We should also note the device that Arabic has for render- ing Greek compounds literally: 3 52, καὶ ὑπερυψούμενος, وفوق; 3 53, καὶ ὑπερένδοξος, كاὶ ὑπεραινετόν, المتعالي; καὶ ὑπερυμνητός, وفوق المسبّح; وفوق المتعا لي.

Although the author of the Arabic version was a good trans- lator, he is not entirely free from literalism. In 11 22, καὶ βρα- χίονες τοῦ κατακλύζοντος κατακλυσθήσονται, where A, 106, and 230 of the group insert καὶ after the participle, the Arabic liter- ally follows its original, وذراعا المغرق فيغرقان. In 10 4, he is so faithful to his manuscript that in Τίγρις Ἐδδέκελ he trans- lates the former and transliterates the latter, الدّجلة اذذاكل.

Apparently he did not recognize in this doublet the gloss which had crept into his text; Τίγρις undoubtedly was originally a scholium on Ἐδδέκελ.

In the case of official terms, a compound word may be translated literally. Thus τοπάρχαι 3 2–3 is rendered exactly by رؤسآء المواضع; in the same passages στρατηγοί is translated by الجند, just as we may refer to the army, not as a body of men, but as a department. We meet σατράπαι 'satraps' in 2 48; 3 94; and 6 1. Now this is an Old Persian word, xšaθra-pāvan, 'the lord or protector of a region, kingdom, or *imperium*'. In finding an equivalent for this word, the translator made a combination that emphasizes only one of the functions of a satrap, عظمآء الجيوش i. e., the commander-in-chief of the army in his own district or satrapy.

In the case of the words 'kings' and 'kingdom', the translation of καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν βασιλέων ἐκείνων (2 44) by وفي ايّام تلك المملكات and τρεῖς βασιλεῖς (11 2) by ثلاث مملكات, does not imply that the translator had before him a different text. In his renderings he frequently displays some originality and by using the word for 'kingdom', he did not materially alter the sense.

Semitisms in the Greek have been correctly understood. Thus in 3 36, the reading of the group οἷς ἐλάλησας πρὸς αὐτούς, is turned literally into الّذين تكلّمت معهم. Of course the translator could not have done otherwise with this passage. In 10 18, we have another and more difficult Semitism; καὶ προσέθετο καὶ ἥψατό μου which is aptly represented by وعاد فلمسني. This does not imply that the translator had at his elbow the Hebrew or the Syriac versions and solved un-Greek idioms by referring to the readings in either of these languages. We may rather assume that the expression seemed so natural to him that he found no difficulty in accurately rendering it into Arabic. In 2 13, we apparently have another Semitism: καὶ τὸ δόγμα ἐξῆλθεν καὶ οἱ σοφοὶ ἀπεκτέννοντο. This the translator very neatly renders, وخرج أمره بقتل الحكمآء.

Among Semitisms we may also classify μαννά, 2 48, which represents Aramaic מַנְתָא; this is rendered by هدايا, a plural. It appears, accordingly, that μαννά was understood as a plural noun. Now it is possible that the translator recognized this word as Semitic, and by comparing it with مَنْ derived the correct meaning. On the other hand, he may have had a gloss in his manuscript; 36 has δῶρον in the margin in another hand.

Similarly, a Semitism is discernible in 'Εφαδανώ, 11 45, which in A and 106 appears as ἐν φαδ'ινώ. To one knowing Arabic, this suggested فَدَّان, and accordingly our translator rendered it by a synonym في مكان سهل.

When we come to the three Aramaic words, Μανή, Θεκέλ, Φαρές, in 5 25, we notice that they are not transliterated, but rendered into Arabic by passive participles, مقيس موزون مقسوم. Now it is quite probable that our translator arrived at this interpretation from the explanation of these words in verses 26, 27, and 28. We may wonder whether he knew Aramaic or Syriac and recognized in Μανή the Qal passive participle of מַנֵה; then by analogy he may have translated the other two by the passive. On the other hand it is just as likely that because the second and third are defined in Greek by the passive, the first by analogy was also rendered into the same voice. We hardly have a right to expect our translator to recognize the *double entente* that is latent in these three Aramaic words. What he has given us is a fluent and approximately correct translation of the passage.

It seems, indeed, rather conclusive that the translator had no Hebrew or Syriac manuscript by means of which he could discover the original meaning of a passage which is ambiguous in Greek. In 11 19, καὶ ἀσθενήσει καὶ πεσεῖται καὶ οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται, there is a difficulty, since the Greek verb has no gender. The translator here probably took ἡ ἰσχύς to be the subject, as the form of the verb indicates: فتضعف وتسقط ولا توجد. If he had consulted either the Hebrew or the Syriac, he would not have fallen into this error.

Personal names are not simply transliterated but turned

into the native idiom; e. g. Ναβουχοδονοσόρ, خُتَنَصّر; Μωσῆς,

موسى; Γαβριήλ, جبريّل. The only name that requires explan-
ation is the rendering of Ἀμελσάδ 1 11. Professor Montgomery
appears to have solved this name; מֶלְצַר is for original מִנְצַר,
probably Pael ppl.; it is not a name but an official title. The
reading of the Syriac according to the Urmia and Ceriani editions,
ܡܢܨܪ and the Arabic مناصر, agree in having the correct tradi-
tion of the root נצר. The word, therefore, means 'protector,
keeper'. This is due rather to a tradition than to Syriac influence.

In the case of geographical names we find that they are
not slavishly transliterated, but rendered accurately into their
Arabic equivalents. Thus 1 2, Σενναάρ is العراق (Irak); 3 97,
ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ βαβυλῶνος is في كورة بابل; 8 2, ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰλάμ
is في كورة الاهواز (Ahwāz). Another instance that our author of
the Arabic version knew his geography is found in 9 48; here
καὶ Λιβύων καὶ Αἰθιόπων is represented by ولنوبة والحبش. Natur-
ally he experienced no difficulty in 11 41: Ἐδὼμ καὶ Μωάβ καὶ
ἀρχὴ υἱῶν Ἀμμών; ادوم وموآب وبدو بني عمون. But note that
he correctly writes the ع in Ἀμμών (עמון).

Once, however, we note an error in his interpretation of a
geographical name. In 11 16, for ἐν τῇ γῇ τοῦ σαβείρ, where
A and 106 have σαββείρ, it seems that his manuscript read
σαβαείν, σαβαεί, or σαβείν, as in 11 41. At any rate the Arabic
translation is في ارض صابيين, 'in the land of the Sabaeans.'
In 11 41, for σαβαείν, the margin of 36 has Σαβαεί and V,
σαβείν. In this verse he likewise translates, ارض صابيين.
Apparently the strange word offered him no serious difficulty,
since his rendering, 'Sabaeans', takes advantage of a name
which sounded approximately like σαβαείν.[1] The Sabaeans, of
course, were a well-known people, and so he naturally lighted
upon this interpretation. Now it is possible that in 11 16 his
text read σαβείρ; in that case he came to his rendering by a
comparison with verse 41.

---

[1] Cf. also 11 45, εἰς ὄρος σαβαεὶν ἅγιον.

On the whole the Arabic version is a faithful and accurate translation. Still we come across passages where the rendition is influenced by the translator's individual interpretation. In

8 25, καὶ ὁ ζυγὸς τοῦ κλοιοῦ αὐτοῦ κατευθυνεῖ, ونير إصره يستقيم.

it appears that he explained the verse by a reminiscence of Isaiah 9 (4) 3, διότι ἀφήρηται ὁ ζυγὸς ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῶν κείμενος for which the Hebrew has עֻלּ סֻבְּלֹו.

In 11 24, we have another instance where the translator's interpretation shows that his work was based only upon the Greek and that he did not refer to the Hebrew or the Syriac; καὶ ποιήσει ἃ οὐκ ἐποίησαν οἱ πατέρες αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ πατέρες τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ· προνομὴν καὶ σκῦλα καὶ ὕπαρξιν αὐτοῖς διασκορπιεῖ *

ويصنع ما لم تصنعه أباؤه وآبآء ابايه * نهبًا وغنايَم * ويفرّق لهم مالًا. According to this reading we see that the translator understood προνομὴν καὶ σκῦλα as in apposition with the preceding, i. e. ἃ οὐκ ἐποίησαν. If he had known Hebrew or Syriac, he would have construed the three nouns as the direct objects of يفرّق. The syntax of the Greek, however, allowed him to solve the apparent difficulty in this manner.

It appears that in 6 (18) 17, ὅπως μὴ ἀλλοιωθῇ πρᾶγμα ἐν τῷ Δανιήλ, the meaning was not clear to the translator, or the literal significance of ἀλλοιωθῇ made nonsense to him. So he evades the difficulty and does not commit himself to a definite meaning: كيلا يحدث امر بدانيال.

There are, however, instances which are not merely coloured by individual interpretation, but errors due either to misreading the text or to actual mistakes in the Greek original. We cannot, of course, in every case determine who made the error, the scribe of the Greek manuscript or the translator. In 2 47, occurs a mistake in the Arabic of the third person for the second; ὅτι ἠδυνήθης ἀποκαλύψαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο is rendered by

لانّه اقتدر, ان يكشف هذا السرّ. Probably we can exonerate our translator from the error, since manuscript 130 also has the third person, ἠδυνήθη. For ἐξήρθη, 7 4, we have خرجت.

Evidently this interpretation is based on taking ἐξῆλθεν for ἐξήρθη,
a reading also found in manuscripts 148 and 232. Another
misreading is found in 7 25, where يفضل represents πλανήσει, a
reading occurring also in 33, 36, 89, 90, 91, and 238. This is
an error for ταλαιώσει. An error not found in any manuscript
according to Holmes-Parsons is met in 9 23, where for ἐν τῷ
ῥήματι the Arabic has بقوّ كذ; evidently this is founded on mis-
reading ῥώματι for ῥήματι.

It is rather noteworthy how many of these errors accumulate
in Chapter 11. In 11 14 for ἐπαρθήσονται we find ينتزعون
which represents ἀπαρθήσονται. Was it carelessness on the
part of the translator or an error in his manuscript? In 11 15
the meaning has been lost by wrongly dividing πρόσχωμα into
πρὸς χῶμα; καὶ ἐκχεεῖ πρόσχωμα is rendered by وبهرق علي
التراب. Holmes-Parsons notes that the same mistake is found
in the Aldine edition. This, however, does not imply that this
reading was represented in any manuscript; our translator may
have made a similar wrong division independently. For the
error in 11 18, we cannot hold our translator responsible;
κατακαύσει is rendered in the Arabic by وبحرق. This goes back
to κατακαύσει, a reading found in A, Q, and 35 as well as V.
Furthermore in 11 23, ἀναβήσεται is interpreted by a plural verb,
يصعدون. This may be due either to misreading ἀναβήσονται
or to having a manuscript with this reading. The addition by
Q in 11 39 of οὓς ἂν ἐπιγνῷ is turned into لكَي يعرف, which
implies that οὓς was taken for ὅπως or ὡς. Of course we cannot
determine who is responsible for the error.

In 11 20, we have a passage which savours of an individual
interpretation or we may have a text which is not represented
in our present Greek manuscripts; καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης
αὐτοῦ φυτὸν τῆς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑτοιμασίαν αὐτοῦ παραβι-
βάζων πράσσων δόξαν βασιλείας; ويقوم من أصله غرس مملكة
علي تهيئته * ويزيل متعمّدًا شرف المملكة * We may ask, Did
the translator have a different text with καὶ παραβιβάζων τὸν
πράσσοντα, or in trying to make sense out of the passage, did

he arbitrarily make a change? In view of his faithfulness and
honesty in other instances, we shall not lay this solecism to his
account.

Although the Arabic frequently corrects A, it does not always
do so. In 8 11, A rightly reads ἐταράχθη instead of ἐράχθη.
In this instance the Arabic has رتبت, which represents a false
reading ἐτάχθη that is actually found in manuscripts 22 and 231.
Likewise in 11 14, A correctly has λοιμῶν instead of λοιπῶν;
here the Arabic reads بقايا. This was hardly the fault of our
translator, since one manuscript of the group, 230, is represented
by λοιπῶν, an ancient error also found in B.

An error may creep into the text through the influence of
an adjacent passage or one still freshly in the mind of the trans-
lator. In 2 34, we have an increment in النحاس. The name
of this metal probably found its way into this verse through the
proximity of verses 32 and 35, where it occurs. In 3 3 we have
another instance of the influence of one verse upon another.
Verse 2 has τυράννους καὶ τοὺς ἐπ᾽ ἐξουσιῶν, while 3 reads
τύραννοι μεγάλοι οἱ ἐπ᾽ ἐξουσιῶν. The Arabic in 3 has a solecism
which is probably due to the influence of verse 2: والمتملكون
والعظماء الذين لهم السلطان. Likewise in 3 22, ἑπταπλασίως
ἐκ περισσοῦ was added from the nineteenth verse; accordingly
the Arabic has, كثيرًا جدًا سبعة أضعاف. Similarly ἐν τῇ γῇ
of 4 (23) 20, is somehow carried into verse (26) 23, and the Arabic
adds في الأرض.

In 5 11, there is no Arabic equivalent for μάγων; perhaps this
is not an inexplicable omission, since in a series of four nouns
which are practically synonyms, it was easy for one to fall out
either in the Greek original or in the translation. On the other
hand verse 15, which has only three nouns, may have aided in
reducing the four of verse 11 to the same number. In this connexion
we may note that while in 5 15, Q adds χαλδαῖοι, the Arabic does
not in this instance follow Q, which here departs from the group.

At this point we may turn to 9 15, ἡμάρτομεν, ἠνομήσαμεν;
in verse 5 occur ἡμάρτομεν, ἠδικήσαμεν, ἠνομήσαμεν. None of

our group has the three verbs, but it occurs in a number of manuscripts, among which are 130 and one of the Lucianic group, 48. In both verses the Arabic goes, اَخطانا اَثِمنا ظلمنا. It is easier to suppose an influence from verse 5 than dependence on a manuscript outside our group.

Another difficulty may be solved by supposing the influence of an adjacent passage. In 9 26, καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἑβδομάδας τὰς ἑξήκοντα δύο, it appears that the translator had the Greek of the previous verse in mind: ἑβδομάδες ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑβδομάδες ἑξήκοντα δύο. This probably explains the Arabic: وبعد السبعة

اسابيع والإثنين وستين اسبوعًا. *

The use of glosses in the task of translating into Arabic is also significant. One scholium ran an interesting course; 4 (13) 10, ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης μου, καὶ ἰδοὺ εἱρ καὶ ἅγιος. In the margin of 36 εἱρ is defined by ἐγρήγορος. This annotation eventually found its way into the text, and in A, 106, and 35 is inserted after μου. The Arabic, however, represents a better text and translates εἱρ καὶ ἅγιος by يقظان وقدوس.[10]

In 8 13, it appears that a marginal note or a variant reading came to be incorporated into the text: καὶ ἤκουσα ἑνὸς ἁγίου λαλοῦντος. Manuscript 103 has ἀγγέλου for ἁγίου. The Arabic contains both: وسمعت واحدًا من الملائكة الاطهار متكلّمًا. Evidently the source of our version had both ἀγγέλου and ἁγίου.

In 10 9, ἤμην κατανενυγμένος, the Arabic has an easy rendering صرت متخشعًا. One may wonder whether this is a direct translation of κατανενυγμένος or whether it was influenced or aided by a gloss, καταφερόμενος, as is found in the margin of 36.

In 11 38, we meet what, at first thought, may appear to be influence from the Peshitta: καὶ θεὸν μαωζείν (A, μαωζεί); 𝔖 ܚܣܝܢܐ. It is just as reasonable, however, to believe that Arabic عزيز is derived from a gloss based on 𝔖 מעזים. It is interesting

---

10 Cf. 4 (28) 20, where we have the accusative of the same words.

to note in this connexion that the Arabic employs the same root
as the Hebrew.

In 1 3, we have ἀπὸ τῶν φορθομμείν (A, πορθομμείν), where
the Septuagint fitly interprets the Hebrew מְהֻדְּדֹתָם by ἐκ τῶν
ἐπιλέκτων. Theodotion's transliteration of this word, however,
utterly disguised its meaning, and if our translator had no gloss
in his manuscript on this word, we need not be surprised that
he missed the point. Again it is evident that he did not have re-
course either to the Hebrew or to the Syriac. If the latter, he might
have translated it 'Parthians'. Is it going too far afield to sup-
pose that our translator made out of it or tried to read into
it ἀπορυττομένων? At any rate, he rendered it من الأكرة,
'diggers', 'farmers.'

As stated before, the Polyglot "Arabic" text belongs to the
Or^C group; the evidence is so consistent and conclusive that it
is not necessary to publish all the points of agreement between
our text and the group. It is more important to note the excep-
tions and the solecisms which have no counterpart in the original.
I have also deemed it advisable to note certain apparent excep-
tions which in themselves do not necessarily imply that they go
back to a different text or were represented in any manuscript.
In a subsequent list of these words and pronominal suffixes,
we shall observe that they are due to the translator's ability to
make a smooth and fluent rendering. It is not probable that
the author of the Arabic version had before him a number of
manuscripts with various readings representing different groups.
Nor do I believe that he selected what in his mind was the
more likely reading from several manuscripts and thereby left
us a conflate text. I should rather think that he had one manu-
script and that on the whole it was a good one; on this he
exerted himself to his utmost ability to produce an accurate
and fluent rendering. In this he has succeeded admirably.

As has been observed before in this essay, we do not have a
literalistic version. Consequently we may allow our translator
freedom of various kinds in minor details. We are not justified
in expecting that every Arabic word should have its exact
counterpart in the Greek. We find, accordingly, a number of

expressions which cannot be used as representing a definite reading in the Greek original. Thus in 2 11, مع كلّ ذي لحم for μετὰ πάσης σαρκός hardly has any textual value. Nor does the demonstrative for the definite article mean anything; e. g., 2 44, في ايّام تلك, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις; 12 9, هذه الكلمات, οἱ λόγοι. The use of the conjunction 'and' proves nothing; the translator may insert it occasionally for a smoother reading; e. g., 3 1, وفي السّنة الثّامنة عشر for ἔτους ὀκτωκαιδεκάτου. In 3 4, instead of the asyndeton ὑμῖν λέγεται ἔθνη, λαοί, φυλαί, γλῶσσαι, the Arabic uses the conjunction, الامم والشّعوب والقبايل والالسن *. Examples of the addition or insertion of 'and' could be multiplied, but there is no profit in quoting more specimens. In 11 29, where A and Q^mg and 106 read καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὡς ἡ πρώτη καὶ ὡς ἡ ἐσχάτη, the Arabic has, وليس يكون مثل الاولي ولا مثل الاخيرة. When the translator adds لا, he introduces no new idea; no doubt he made this addition independently for the sake of clearness.

In 9 3, τὸν θεόν is rendered by إلهي; in 9 4, τὸν θεόν μου is likewise translated by إلهي. This hardly means that the writer of the Arabic had a text in which both verses contained τὸν θεόν μου; he may have been influenced by verse 4, or he may have added the pronoun because to him it made a smoother reading. In fact the presence of a pronominal suffix does not *per se* connect a passage with a certain group of manuscripts nor justify us in assuming a colouring from an extraneous group. When 3 41, καὶ νῦν ἐξακολουθοῦμεν ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ is represented by والان نتبعك بكلّ قلب, we have a reading found in 51 and 231, but this does not necessarily imply a Lucianic connexion or influence. In the same verse φοβούμεθα takes as a direct object σε; the Arabic has the same pronoun as the object of the first verb ἐξακολουθοῦμεν as well; a faithful translator may make this slight addition, even though the original does not have it.

A preposition with a pronominal suffix as لـه with قال in 4 (10) 16 where the Greek simply has εἶπεν, has no textual significance; it may have been added to make a more polished reading.

In 11 26, δυνάμεις is modified by αὐτοῦ in 22, 36, 48, 51, 231 of the Lucianic group and by 34 and c; here the Arabic has جيشه. Again, I believe that this does not prove any Lucianic influence, but that our interpreter was a man of good judgment and with the addition of the possessive improved his style. For some other cases of the addition of pronominal suffixes which cannot be regarded as solecisms, we may note the following examples: 2 13, τὸ δόγμα, امره; 2 38, ἔδωκεν دفعها; 5 20, ἡ τιμή, كرامته: 5 23, both τοὺς θεούς الهتى, and τὸν θεόν, الهى; 7 3, στόμα, فمه; 11 35, καὶ τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι, ويختارهم. In all these cases we are probably dealing, not with different readings in the Greek, but rather with idiomatic renderings. It is evident that our interpreter, while faithful in his work, could add little touches and thereby embellish his product.

Now in 3 12, we find عَلَي جميع أعمال for ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα; this certainly is not a literal translation. At first I took it as indicating a different text, but probably the word جميع should not be taken too seriously. Perhaps the translator only gave an emphatic touch to his rendering. Conversely in 6 (4) 3, ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ is turned into عَلَي مملكته. As we noticed before, our translator is not bound by stereotyped forms in reproducing the thought in Arabic. Did he allow himself a slight liberty? It is possible that he did, since the general sense has not been altered.

In the τῶν παιδῶν ἁγιῶν αἴνεσις, we note the following peculiarities of the arrangement of the verses. In the Arabic, 3 64 is left out by parablepsy. Who is responsible, the Greek scribe or the author of the Arabic version? 3 69 = Arabic 71; 3 70 = Arabic 72; 3 71 = Arabic 69; 3 72 = Arabic 70. A transposes verses 73 and 74, but the Arabic does not.

Among the solecisms, there is one case of the transposition

of a word; 11 35, ἕως καιροῦ τέρας. ὅτι ἔτι εἰς καιρόν ✶ إلى الزمان .لانّ الانتهآء ايضًا إلى زمان ✶

We have simplification in 3 9; A, καὶ ὑπολαβόντες εἶπον N. τῷ βασ.; Q, 130, τῷ βασ. N. καὶ εἶπαν. Here the Arabic reads وقالوا للملك. In omitting Ναβουχοδονοσόρ it has a simplified reading which is also found in 33 and 149.

In 6 (22) 21, καὶ εἶπεν Δανὴλ τῷ βασιλεῖ βασιλεῦ, by haplography the Arabic omits the dative; فقال دانيال ايها الملك.

There are also a few additions which are unique to the Arabic text and which deserve our consideration: 11 20 has been considered above; 12 8, وما هذه الامثال.

There is also a list of omissions which are unique to the Arabic text:

1 12, καὶ ὕδωρ πιώμεθα;
2 11, βαρύς
3 64, omission of the whole verse by parablepsy;
5 11; μάγων has been treated above;
7 27, καὶ ὑπακούσονται
8 18, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
11 35, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν συνιέντων
12 4, καὶ σφράγισον τὸ βιβλίον.

Although the Arabic recension is a good representative of the Or^C text, there are some readings that must be explained from another source. For Θ 3 13, καὶ ἤχθησαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως, the Lucianic group as represented by 22, 36, 48, 51, and 231 reads: καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖνοι ἤχθησαν. On the other hand, the Or^P group as is indicated by 23, 62, and 147 reads: καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἤχθησαν. The following is the Arabic rendering: واولئك الرجال تقدموا امام الملك. I cannot stress the demonstrative in the Arabic, as we have previously noted, but here we have either an Or^P reading or Lucianic influence.

In two cases we meet distinct traces of the Or^P group. Thus in 8 5, the addition في السوس is represented by ἐν Σούσοις, an ancient dittograph for the following συνίων, in 62 and 147; also in 130 with which 𝔄 frequently agrees. In 10 4, there is

a plus في السَّنَةِ الثَّامِنَةِ عشرَ, which is also found in 62 and
147, ἐν τῷ ὄκτω καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει; this probably came in from 3 1,
Ἔτους ὀκτωκαιδεκάτου. In this connexion compare the Vetus
Latina, [11] *in XVI anno*, which doubtless is a corruption of the
above.

In 4 (9) 6, we have a Lucianic addition: καὶ τὴν σύγκρισιν
αὐτοῦ εἰπόν μοι + καὶ αἱ ὁράσεις τῆς κεφαλῆς μου: وقل لي تاويله
ومناظر راسي. This plus is found Q[1] (*subt. lineas*) and the follow-
ing members of the Lucianic group: 22, 36, 48, and 231.
Holmes-Parsons cites no other manuscripts as having this
reading.

The Septuagint, as we should expect, has not been without
its influences on our text. Let us note the following instances:
8 2, Θ, ἐπὶ τοῦ Οὐβάλ; 𝔖 كحـجـل فـحـد ححـا; 𝔊 πρὸς τῇ πύλῃ
Αἰλάμ; 8 3, Θ, ἑστηκὼς πρὸ τοῦ Οὐβάλ; 𝔊, ἀπέναντι τῆς πύλης;
𝔖, احفـحـا فـلإم مـهم; 8 16, Θ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ Οὐβάλ. We need
not assume in these passages any influence of 𝔖; 𝔊 translates
אובל by πύλη which is similar in meaning to احفـجـا. From
this rendering of the Septuagint, which probably appeared as
a gloss in our translator's manuscript, we have in the three
verses, الدَّهليز, 'a hall, passage, antechamber.'

Next in order comes 10 21, Θ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς ἀντεχόμενος
μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ; 𝔊, καὶ οὐθεὶς ἦν ὁ βοηθῶν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ; 𝔄 وليس أحد
يساعدني معي من أجل هذه. Now while Theodotion's ἀντ-
εχόμενος is a translation of 𝔥 עם מתחזק, it is extremely doubtful
whether the author of 𝔄 could have made such a lucid render-
ing without ὁ βοηθῶν of the Septuagint which, if not in the text
of the translator's manuscript, existed at least in a marginal
note.

Let us now consider 11 4, Θ καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα αὐτοῦ;
𝔊, οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἀλκὴν αὐτοῦ. No doubt in turning εἰς into Arabic
كـ, the translator was influenced by 𝔊, κατά.

There may also be some 𝔊 influence which is represented
in Q. No doubt it had found its way into the group and so has

11 Ranke, *Par Palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium*, Vienna, 1871.

left its traces in 𝔄. In this category, let us turn to 5 14, ὅτι πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐν σοί. Q and the Lucianic manuscripts, 22, 36, 48, 51, 231 insert ἅγιον after θεοῦ. No new idea, in fact, is added here; the meaning of πνεῦμα θεοῦ necessarily implies ἅγιον as a matter of course. The supplementary word may have found its way into the text from a gloss which was a self-evident definition or possibly a reminiscence of 𝔊, 5 12, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστι. At any rate Arabic renders it as follows: ان روح اللّه القدوس فيك.

In 10 10, A and Q* read ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατά μου καὶ ταρσοὺς χειρῶν μου. Instead of χειρῶν μου, the margin of Q has ποδῶν μου, which no doubt is derived from 𝔊, ἐπὶ τὰ ἴχνη τῶν ποδῶν μου. This is represented in the Arabic, علي ركبتي وأمشاط رجلي. Three passages, however, cannot be satisfactorily explained without Peshitta influence; 10 5, Θ, ἐνδεδυμένος βαδδείν; 𝔊, ἐνδε-δυμένος βύσσινα; ﺱ ܟܣ̈ܬܗ̇ ܚܠܝ̈ܢܐ; 𝔄 لابس الثواب كرابة; 12 6, Θ, τῷ ἐνδεδυμένῳ τὰ βαδδείν; 𝔊, τῷ περιβεβλημένῳ τὰ βύσσινα; ﺱ ܟܣ̈ܬܗ̇ ܚܠܝ̈ܢܐ; 𝔄 للّابس الثواب الوقار. Cf. also 12 7. There is no doubt that we are confronted by a literal translation from the Peshitta. βύσσινα of the Septuagint in it-self alone could hardly be the basis of the Arabic rendering.

In this case I believe that the translator did not refer to the Peshitta. Several observations previously stated in this essay have confirmed me in this opinion. We may wonder whether the Syrian Arabic recension to which reference has been made in this article, existed before this time and whether he was ac-quainted with that version. Doubtless he had access to an Arabic edition which originated in Syria. The Arabic trans-lations of the Scriptures certainly did not have only a local in-fluence. For example, the translation of the Gospels by Isaak Velasquez of Cordoba had found its way to the East.[13] The literary intercourse between the various portions of the Arabic-speaking world is remarkable.

While A is a member of the Or𝐶 group, it is far from being

13 Graf, op. cit., 28-30.

its best representative; 106 usually agrees with A. This study
has conclusively revealed the fact that 𝔄 has fewer errors than
A and is a better representative of the group. In many instances
𝔄 corrects serious errors in A. In two instances, however, 8 11,
and 11 14, as we have seen above, where A is correct, the Arabic
errs in departing from it. A list of the cases where 𝔄 does not
agree with A will be given below: in all these examples 𝔄
follows the group. This enumeration of important readings
where 𝔄 and the group coincide, but differ from A, shows at a
glance the unique importance of 𝔄 in making any textual study
of Or^C : 1 10; 2 34, 35; 3 1, 9, 15, 17, 28; 4 (9) 6, (14) 11, (33) 30, (34)
31; 5 3, 8, 9, 16, 21, 23; 7 4, 7, 10, 13, 17; 8 10, 20; 9 3, 12, 21; 10 12,
16, 19, 36, 37, 40, 45; 12 4; 12 10, omission of ἐκλευκανθῶσιν by A.

The position of Q in the Or^C group has also been reenforced
by this study of the Arabic version. Although Q shows some
independence of readings, it is a member of the Or^C group.
In 2 5, its addition of ἀπαγγείλητέ μοι is not represented in 𝔄;
in 5 15, its insertion of Χαλδαῖοι is not translated in 𝔄; in 5 3,
Q^mg agrees with A in omitting τοῦ θεοῦ, which 𝔄 translates.
These, however, are only a few instances in comparison with
the overwhelming number of agreements between 𝔄 and Q.
Thus, for example, in 3 9, and 4 (9) 8, 𝔄 agrees with Q 1 (subt. lineas);
Q^mg, 12 10, adds ἐκλευκανθῶσιν, which A omits, but 𝔄 translates.
In 8 9, the change of δύναμιν to δύσιν was easy enough on ac-
count of the other two directions, νότος and ἀνατολή, found in
this verse according to the reading of the group. Here Q and
230 both have πρὸς τὴν δύσιν, which is also found in 𝔄. الى
الغرب. In 8 10, Q, 42, and 230 correctly have καὶ συνεπάτησεν
αὐτά, which 𝔄 renders by ودسهم. Cf. 𝔏 conculcavit.[13] Thus
the correct reading has been perpetuated in a few widely
separated texts. In 9 5, the word order of Q agrees with Or^P in
23, 62, and 147 and with the Lucianic group in 22, 36, 48, and
231. In this case, however, 𝔄 and Q also agree. The figures
before the verbs show how literal the Arabic is, even in the
word order: Q, (1) ἡμάρτομεν, (2) ἠνομήσαμεν, (3) ἠδικήσαμεν,

---

[13] Ranke, op. cit.

(4) ἠσεβήσαμεν, (5) καὶ ἀπέστημεν, (6) καὶ ἐξεκλίναμεν; (1) أخطانا
(2) اثمنا (3) ظلمنا (4) نافقنا (5) وتباعدنا (6) وحدنا.

This study of the "Polyglot" Arabic text of Daniel proves that the Arabic recension is a member of the Or^C group. It is vastly superior to A and beyond a doubt is the best representative of the group that we now possess. In the past the value of the Arabic Bible was not appreciated because it is a version of a version. It is evident, however, that such a prejudice has no foundation and that not much has been lost in this translation. The Arabic language is in its spirit so well adapted for making an exact rendering of the Greek that we have in this book a faithful model of the Or^C group. It is an excellent translation, and while it is literal, it is not literalistic. For this reason the text of the Melchite Church has a unique value in Old Testament textual criticism.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS